

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS."

VOL. 2.—NO. 38.

SALEM, OHIO, FRIDAY, APRIL 23, 1847.

WHOLE NO. 50.

All remittances to be made, and all letters
relating to the pecuniary affairs of the paper,
to be addressed (post paid) to the General
Agent, or to the Editor, at the office of the
Bugle, in Salem, Ohio.

Terms:—\$1.50 per annum, or \$1.25
(invariably required) if not paid within six
months of the time of subscription.
Advertisements making less than a square
inserted three times for 75 cents—one
square \$1.

Printed for the Publishing Committee by
G. N. HAPGOOD.

From the National A. S. Standard.

Lysander Spooner on the Constitution.

"DOMESTIC SLAVERY IS THE MOST PROMINENT
FEATURE IN THE ARISTOCRATIC COUNTER-
REFORMATION OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTION."
Governor Morris in the Convention of 1787.
Madison Papers.

In our criticism of the Constitution, we
have proceeded thus far on the plan of allow-
ing Mr. Spooner to explain the rules of law
in his own way, and to extend them as far
as he pleases. Let us now pause a moment,
and see whether any legal decisions or prin-
ciples sustain him to the full extent of the
rules he lays down. These are: (p. 62.)

1st. "Where words are susceptible of two
meanings, one consistent, and the other in-
consistent, with justice and natural right, that
meaning, and only that meaning, which is con-
sistent with right shall be attributed to them
—unless other parts of the instrument over-
rule that interpretation."

2d. "Another rule is, that no extraneous
or historical evidence shall be admitted to fix
upon a statute an unjust or immoral meaning,
when the words themselves of the act are sus-
ceptible of an innocent one."

The only authority he adduces in support
of these is the following sentence from 2
Cranch, 390:

"Where rights are infringed, where funda-
mental principles are overthrown, where the
general system of the law is departed from,
the legislative intention must be expressed
with irresistible clearness, to induce a Court
of Justice to suppose a design to effect such
objects."

We see nothing here which supports the
second rule laid down by Mr. Spooner. The
Court hold that "the intention must be ex-
pressed with irresistible clearness," but any
nothing of the means by which they will ar-
rive at such irresistible certainty as to the in-
tention of the legislator, whether they shall
be exclusively internal or not. Elsewhere he
cites the language of Marshall—"The inten-
tion is to be collected from the words."—(12
Wheaton, 332.) But neither does this sup-
port Mr. Spooner's second rule, for it is evi-
dent from all the other decisions of the Chief
Justice, that where words are ambiguous, and
admit of a construction more or less extended,
the extent of the power is to be fixed by con-
sidering the general objects of the Constitu-
tion, the practice under it, and the historical
evidence of the meaning. In all his great de-
cisions he constantly refers to the history and
institutions of the country. He does so in
this case.

6. Wheaton, 504; 9. Wheaton, 1; 12. Wheat-
on, 419. In 9. Wheaton, 1, he says:

"We know of no rule for constraining the
extent of such powers, other than the language
of the instrument which confers them, taken
in connection with the purposes for which
they were conferred."

Let the reader refer, on this point, to the
authorities cited in our second article, espe-
cially to that from 3. Howard, 24. In the
whole course of the Supreme Court decisions
we know of no such rule as this second one
of Mr. Spooner's. In the whole of Judge
Story's chapter on rules of interpretation,
(Comm. Bk. 111. c. v.) where he has grouped
together all the decisions of the Supreme
Court on this point, there is no allusion to
any such principle. On the contrary, Story
lays it down that "a power granted in gen-
eral terms, is to be co-extensive with the terms
unless some clear restriction on it is deducible
from the context." "Arguments from im-
policy or inconvenience ought to have no
weight; they are an unsafe guide; men dif-
fer, and times differ," &c. &c. And again:
"The causes which led to the enactment of a
law are often the best explication of its words."
—Comm. Bk. 131. c. 40, § 410. That the same
rule prevails in England is shown by our
previous extracts. In 8. Bingham, 181, also, Chief
Justice Tindal said:

"If the words of an instrument be ambigu-
ous, the Court will call in aid the *act done*
under it, as a clue to the intention of the par-
ties."—See *Dwarris*, 605. 1. Kent, 463.

As we have remarked before, reference to
the institutions of the country and its history
is one of the means the Courts use to deter-
mine, with irresistible clearness, the meaning
of statutes.

Any other principle would lead to innum-
erable absurdities. We will adduce one or
two:

The Constitution makes every "natural
born citizen" eligible to the office of Presi-
dent. Now, women are citizens. Are they
eligible? Here is a case precisely within
Mr. Spooner's rules; the words are suscep-
tible of a meaning consistent with natural jus-
tice; in which case he says, "that meaning,
and only that meaning, is to be adopted."

Rutherford (Natural Law, a work of high
authority), admits that antecedent to some
special "compact" women have the same
"natural right" as men to act, vote, &c., as
members of civil society. p. 238.

Now, also, that taxation and representation
on American territory, this forms another rea-
son for allowing them a participation in the
honors and authority of office. Plainly, then,
according to Mr. Spooner's rules, women
are just as plain that this is not law, nor the
meaning of the Constitution; and that the
Supreme Court would be justified in referring
to the history and customs of the country and
of the race and class of nations to which we
belong in so construing this clause.

Mr. Spooner has foreseen this absurd con-
sequence of his rules, and unwilling to fol-
low them to their natural result, has endeav-
ored to guard against it, by pointing out that
the Constitution, in speaking of the President,
always uses the masculine gender. But this
argument proves too much. It would admit
women out of the protection of almost all con-
stitutional provisions. For instance, "no
person shall be compelled to be a witness

against himself, nor be deprived of life, lib-
erty or property, without due process of law;"
the accused shall enjoy the right to be con-
fronted with the witnesses against him, "to
have counsel for his defence." "A person,
charged with crime, shall be delivered up on
demand of the State from which he fled."—
Here and elsewhere the masculine gender only
is used, but are not women included? It
is a principle of law too well known for Mr.
Spooner to have overlooked it, that in statutes
the masculine gender includes both sexes.—
See Coke, 2. Inst. 45. Chitty's Contracts.
Dwarris 713.

If instead of legal rules, we refer only to
general and popular usage the same is true.
He that believeth and is baptized shall be
saved, and he that believeth not shall be
damned." "has always been supposed to apply
as much to women as to men."

In this case, therefore, if we construe the
clause according to Mr. Spooner's rules, we
men are constitutionally eligible to the Presi-
dency; nothing but "extraneous and histor-
ical evidence" shields us from this result. As
Mr. Spooner does not allow of this when it
will fix upon a clause any meaning contrary
to "natural right," he is bound so to construe
this provision, or to give up his rules, and
more especially his second one.

So Congress has the power to "define and
punish piracy."

Suppose the Anti-Capital Punishment party
should increase, and insist that "to punish"
may mean to imprison, does not necessarily
refer to CAPITAL punishment—that this is
"inconsistent with natural right"—hence,
"as an innocent meaning and no other must
be ascribed to the Constitution," the Supreme
Court are bound to decide that the
Constitution does not give Congress power
to punish pirates with death. This would
be legitimate on Mr. Spooner's rule, but would
it not be absurd? Ought not that Court to
inquire what were the ideas and laws of 1789
on the subject, and if "on this extraneous
and historical evidence" they found that capital
punishment was not then deemed wrong,
ought they not to consider this "an irresisti-
ble clearness of expression," and to hold the
construction innocent and admissible? The
same may be said of slavery.

Again: "where words are susceptible of
two meanings, one consistent and the other
inconsistent with justice and natural right,"

Here the question arises, who is to decide
whether a construction is or is not consistent
with natural right? By what test are Courts
to determine what is right and wrong? Mr.
Spooner leaves it to be supposed that where-
ever a thing is generally considered wrong,
that it is.

But who shall decide what "sound moral"
is? The Court of King's Bench, in London,
perhaps the first Court in the world, awarded
to a Spaniard damages against an English-
man who had taken possession on the high
seas, wrongfully, of certain slaves belonging
to the Spaniard, on the ground that Slavery,
though contrary to justice, was not forbidden
by the nations or the law of Spain.

Contracts founded on immoral considera-
tions are void. But Chief Justice Shaw at-
tended, in the *Med case*, that a contract for
the sale of a slave made in New Orleans, where
Slavery is lawful, would be enforced in Mas-
sachusetts.

These instances show that Courts will look
to the general spirit of the national laws, to
discover whether a rule, or provision, be im-
moral or inconsistent with right, and will find
it "by the law," as Coke says, "what is
justice."

The language of Lord Stowell in regard to
the Slave-Trade proceeds on the same prin-
ciple:

"I must remember that in discussing this
question, I must consider it not according to
any private moral apprehensions of my own,
(if I entertained them ever so sincerely,) but
as the law considers it. * * * An act must
be legally criminal, because neither this Court
or any other can carry its private apprehen-
sions, independent of law, into its public
judgments, on the quality of actions. It must
conform to the judgment of the law upon that
subject, and acting as a Court, in the admin-
istration of law, it cannot attribute criminality
to an act where the law imposes none. It
must look to the legal standard of morality
on a question of this nature."

And that standard must be found in the law
of nations, as fixed and evidenced by general
ancient, and admitted practice, by treaties,
and by the general tenor of the laws and or-
dinances and formal transactions of civilized
States."—2. Dodson Adm. 247.

Marshall quoted and endorses this in 10
Wheaton 66, cited in our first article.

The language of our Supreme Court when-
ever the justice of Indian land titles has come
before them, will show the same principle.

In 6. Wheaton, 543. Chief Justice Mar-
shall:

"We will not enter into the controversy
whether agriculturists, merchants, and man-
ufacturers have a right, on abstract principles,
to expel hunters. Conquest gives a title,
whatever the private and speculative opin-
ions of individuals may be respecting the
justice of the claim. However extravagant
the pretension of converting the discovery
of a country into conquest may appear, if the
principle has been asserted in the first in-
stance and afterwards sustained; if a country
has been acquired and held under it; if the
property of the great mass of the community
originally in it, it becomes the law of the
land and cannot be questioned. * * * How-
ever, the restriction may be opposed to nat-
ural right, if it is indispensable, it may, per-
haps, be supported by reason and certainly cannot
be rejected by Courts of Justice."

In 4. Howard, 573, the Supreme Court
say of the same point, Indian titles:

"It would be useless, at this day, to in-
quire whether the principle thus adopted is
just or not."

It was long the custom and rule in England
that acts of Parliament passed the last day
of the session, had the same efficacy as if pas-

sed the first day of the session. Hence, if, dur-
ing the session, a man did an act legal at
the time, he was still liable to suffer any pun-
ishment, even death, afterwards prescribed by
the statute. On this principle, acknowledged
to be absurd and unjust, one man would have
been executed for an act which was not mur-
der when he did it, unless the King had par-
doned him.—1. Lev. 91. Still this custom
so far conformed to legal principles, that it re-
mained in force three centuries, and no au-
thority but that of the whole Parliament could
repeal it.—See note to Blackstone, 1. 70.—
Here we see that the Courts by which cus-
toms do not mean morally wicked, but such
as violate the general system of the law.

"Customs, says Blackstone, must be rea-
sonable." "Which is not always, says Coke,
to be understood of every unlearned man's
reason, but of artificial and legal reason, war-
ranted by authority of law."—Blackstone
Comm., 1. 70. See other instances, 3. 430.
Story Equity 1. 8, 16.

"Slavery," says Lord Stowell, one of the
first Judges of the age, "never was in Anti-
guity the creature of law, but of that custom
which operates with the force of law, and
when it is cried out that 'mores sunt abolen-
di est,' (bad customs are to be abolished,) it
is first to be proved that even in the consid-
eration of England the custom of slavery
is considered as a *malum usum* (bad custom)
in the colonies."—2. Hegg. Adm. 94.

In the face of this rule that "bad customs
are not binding and not law"—the system of
villainage, (which Slavery under which men
and women were bought and sold, like cat-
tles; see Stephens, Blackstone, Coke,) grew
up from custom alone, was held legal for cen-
turies, and did not only by disease, with-
out the enactment of a law in regard to it from
the beginning to the end of its existence;
clearly showing that the Courts in construing
the word *bad*, in this connection, will have
respect to the usages and laws of the land in
which they are sitting.

Dwarris also, in discussing the question,
whether laws against reason are void, says:

"We must distinguish between right and
power, between moral fitness and political
authority. It must not be entertained as a
question of ethics, but of the bounds and lim-
its of legislative power."—p. 645.

And Coke, even when he went so far as
to think that bad law might be disregarded,
tells the Judges that they are not to be guided
by the crooked cord of discretion, but by the
golden thread of the law.

It is a general principle that no Court will
give effect to the law of another nation, if
that law is inconsistent with the law of the
nation in which they sit.

But who shall decide what "sound moral"
is?

The Court of King's Bench, in London,
perhaps the first Court in the world, awarded
to a Spaniard damages against an English-
man who had taken possession on the high
seas, wrongfully, of certain slaves belonging
to the Spaniard, on the ground that Slavery,
though contrary to justice, was not forbidden
by the nations or the law of Spain.

Contracts founded on immoral considera-
tions are void. But Chief Justice Shaw at-
tended, in the *Med case*, that a contract for
the sale of a slave made in New Orleans, where
Slavery is lawful, would be enforced in Mas-
sachusetts.

These instances show that Courts will look
to the general spirit of the national laws, to
discover whether a rule, or provision, be im-
moral or inconsistent with right, and will find
it "by the law," as Coke says, "what is
justice."

The language of Lord Stowell in regard to
the Slave-Trade proceeds on the same prin-
ciple:

"I must remember that in discussing this
question, I must consider it not according to
any private moral apprehensions of my own,
(if I entertained them ever so sincerely,) but
as the law considers it. * * * An act must
be legally criminal, because neither this Court
or any other can carry its private apprehen-
sions, independent of law, into its public
judgments, on the quality of actions. It must
conform to the judgment of the law upon that
subject, and acting as a Court, in the admin-
istration of law, it cannot attribute criminality
to an act where the law imposes none. It
must look to the legal standard of morality
on a question of this nature."

And that standard must be found in the law
of nations, as fixed and evidenced by general
ancient, and admitted practice, by treaties,
and by the general tenor of the laws and or-
dinances and formal transactions of civilized
States."—2. Dodson Adm. 247.

Marshall quoted and endorses this in 10
Wheaton 66, cited in our first article.

The language of our Supreme Court when-
ever the justice of Indian land titles has come
before them, will show the same principle.

In 6. Wheaton, 543. Chief Justice Mar-
shall:

"We will not enter into the controversy
whether agriculturists, merchants, and man-
ufacturers have a right, on abstract principles,
to expel hunters. Conquest gives a title,
whatever the private and speculative opin-
ions of individuals may be respecting the
justice of the claim. However extravagant
the pretension of converting the discovery
of a country into conquest may appear, if the
principle has been asserted in the first in-
stance and afterwards sustained; if a country
has been acquired and held under it; if the
property of the great mass of the community
originally in it, it becomes the law of the
land and cannot be questioned. * * * How-
ever, the restriction may be opposed to nat-
ural right, if it is indispensable, it may, per-
haps, be supported by reason and certainly cannot
be rejected by Courts of Justice."

In 4. Howard, 573, the Supreme Court
say of the same point, Indian titles:

"It would be useless, at this day, to in-
quire whether the principle thus adopted is
just or not."

It was long the custom and rule in England
that acts of Parliament passed the last day
of the session, had the same efficacy as if pas-

sed the first day of the session. Hence, if, dur-
ing the session, a man did an act legal at
the time, he was still liable to suffer any pun-
ishment, even death, afterwards prescribed by
the statute. On this principle, acknowledged
to be absurd and unjust, one man would have
been executed for an act which was not mur-
der when he did it, unless the King had par-
doned him.—1. Lev. 91. Still this custom
so far conformed to legal principles, that it re-
mained in force three centuries, and no au-
thority but that of the whole Parliament could
repeal it.—See note to Blackstone, 1. 70.—
Here we see that the Courts by which cus-
toms do not mean morally wicked, but such
as violate the general system of the law.

"Customs, says Blackstone, must be rea-
sonable." "Which is not always, says Coke,
to be understood of every unlearned man's
reason, but of artificial and legal reason, war-
ranted by authority of law."—Blackstone
Comm., 1. 70. See other instances, 3. 430.
Story Equity 1. 8, 16.

"Slavery," says Lord Stowell, one of the
first Judges of the age, "never was in Anti-
guity the creature of law, but of that custom
which operates with the force of law, and
when it is cried out that 'mores sunt abolen-
di est,' (bad customs are to be abolished,) it
is first to be proved that even in the consid-
eration of England the custom of slavery
is considered as a *malum usum* (bad custom)
in the colonies."—2. Hegg. Adm. 94.

In the face of this rule that "bad customs
are not binding and not law"—the system of
villainage, (which Slavery under which men
and women were bought and sold, like cat-
tles; see Stephens, Blackstone, Coke,) grew
up from custom alone, was held legal for cen-
turies, and did not only by disease, with-
out the enactment of a law in regard to it from
the beginning to the end of its existence;
clearly showing that the Courts in construing
the word *bad*, in this connection, will have
respect to the usages and laws of the land in
which they are sitting.

Dwarris also, in discussing the question,
whether laws against reason are void, says:

"We must distinguish between right and
power, between moral fitness and political
authority. It must not be entertained as a
question of ethics, but of the bounds and lim-
its of legislative power."—p. 645.

And Coke, even when he went so far as
to think that bad law might be disregarded,
tells the Judges that they are not to be guided
by the crooked cord of discretion, but by the
golden thread of the law.

It is a general principle that no Court will
give effect to the law of another nation, if
that law is inconsistent with the law of the
nation in which they sit.

But who shall decide what "sound moral"
is?

The Court of King's Bench, in London,
perhaps the first Court in the world, awarded
to a Spaniard damages against an English-
man who had taken possession on the high
seas, wrongfully, of certain slaves belonging
to the Spaniard, on the ground that Slavery,
though contrary to justice, was not forbidden
by the nations or the law of Spain.

Contracts founded on immoral considera-
tions are void. But Chief Justice Shaw at-
tended, in the *Med case*, that a contract for
the sale of a slave made in New Orleans, where
Slavery is lawful, would be enforced in Mas-
sachusetts.

These instances show that Courts will look
to the general spirit of the national laws, to
discover whether a rule, or provision, be im-
moral or inconsistent with right, and will find
it "by the law," as Coke says, "what is
justice."

The language of Lord Stowell in regard to
the Slave-Trade proceeds on the same prin-
ciple:

"I must remember that in discussing this
question, I must consider it not according to
any private moral apprehensions of my own,
(if I entertained them ever so sincerely,) but
as the law considers it. * * * An act must
be legally criminal, because neither this Court
or any other can carry its private apprehen-
sions, independent of law, into its public
judgments, on the quality of actions. It must
conform to the judgment of the law upon that
subject, and acting as a Court, in the admin-
istration of law, it cannot attribute criminality
to an act where the law imposes none. It
must look to the legal standard of morality
on a question of this nature."

And that standard must be found in the law
of nations, as fixed and evidenced by general
ancient, and admitted practice, by treaties,
and by the general tenor of the laws and or-
dinances and formal transactions of civilized
States."—2. Dodson Adm. 247.

Marshall quoted and endorses this in 10
Wheaton 66, cited in our first article.

The language of our Supreme Court when-
ever the justice of Indian land titles has come
before them, will show the same principle.

In 6. Wheaton, 543. Chief Justice Mar-
shall:

"We will not enter into the controversy
whether agriculturists, merchants, and man-
ufacturers have a right, on abstract principles,
to expel hunters. Conquest gives a title,
whatever the private and speculative opin-
ions of individuals may be respecting the
justice of the claim. However extravagant
the pretension of converting the discovery
of a country into conquest may appear, if the
principle has been asserted in the first in-
stance and afterwards sustained; if a country
has been acquired and held under it; if the
property of the great mass of the community
originally in it, it becomes the law of the
land and cannot be questioned. * * * How-
ever, the restriction may be opposed to nat-
ural right, if it is indispensable, it may, per-
haps, be supported by reason and certainly cannot
be rejected by Courts of Justice."

In 4. Howard, 573, the Supreme Court
say of the same point, Indian titles:

"It would be useless, at this day, to in-
quire whether the principle thus adopted is
just or not."

It was long the custom and rule in England
that acts of Parliament passed the last day
of the session, had the same efficacy as if pas-

(which we shall say and by proper consti-
tutional and valid,) but our slave basis of rep-
resentation, and our Ordinance of 1787, ex-
pressly guaranteeing, in so many words, the
continued of fugitive slaves, &c. &c. as well
the constitutional provision on that point to
which we now pass.

"No person, held to service or labor in one
State, under the laws thereof, escaping into
another, shall, in consequence of any law or
regulation therein, be discharged from such
service or labor; but shall be delivered up on
claim of the party to whom such service
or labor may be due."—Art. IV, Sec. 2.

Mr. Spooner's argument on this clause is
the following:—(p. 68. &c.)

"Held to service or labor" is a legal de-
scription of Slavery. Slavery has no neces-
sary reference to "service or labor." It is
properly in *servitus*.

"Under the laws thereof." There
was no constitutional or valid law in the
States, relating to Slavery, at the time the
Constitution was adopted."

"The clause must be construed, if
possible, as sanctioning nothing contrary to
natural right." It may refer to apprentices,
&c. hence, not being "expressed with irre-
sistible clearness," it is not necessary to ap-
ply it to slaves, and being not necessary, it
is not allowable to do so.

This is his argument, let us look at it.
In the first place, we deny that his rules
have any place here, since the legislative in-
tention of referring to slaves is "expressed
with irresistible clearness," which the
Court require. For it is a fundamental rule
of interpretation, that all statutes relating to
one subject are to be taken together, and any
phrase in one is to be explained by referring
to the use of the same phrase in the others.

Lord Mansfield says: (1. Burr, 447.)

"Where there are different statutes in *pari
mater* (on the same subject) though made
at different times, or even, explained, and not
referring to each other, they shall be taken
and construed together, as one system, and
explanatory of each other."

This rule has been recognized and acted
on by every Court which exists in this coun-
try in England. See the Digests.

Now in 1787, the same year that the Con-
stitution was drafted, Congress passed the
Northwestern Ordinance, which says:

"There shall be neither Slavery nor involun-
tary servitude, in said territory, &c. Pro-
vided always that any person, escaping into
the same, from whom labor and service is
lawfully claimed, in any one of the original
States, such fugitive may be lawfully re-
claimed, and carried back to the service of his
or her labor or service, as aforesaid."

This refers to Slavery, for it says so.
It refers to American Slavery, for it was that
which it proposed to exclude from this North-
western Territory. But when it provides for
the surrender of fugitive slaves, it describes
them as "persons from whom labor and ser-
vice is lawfully claimed."

Now in that same year, 1787, the Constitu-
tion was drafted; we might expect a simi-
lar provision, and we find that in providing
for the surrender of certain persons it de-
scribes them as "persons held to service or la-
bor under the laws," to be delivered up on
claim, &c.

The descriptions are exactly alike, and
must refer to the same case. Any Court
would hold, and be justified in holding, un-
der Mansfield's rule, that the meaning, to
wit, the surrender of fugitive slaves, was
"expressed with irresistible clearness."

We might stop here, as having made out
our case, but we are willing to meet Mr.
Spooner on his own ground.

The Supreme Court and the national large,
interpret this clause to refer to slaves and to
mean that no State shall shelter, but shall al-
low them to be taken by the national Gov-
ernment, from its limits back to slavery.

Mr. Spooner thinks this "contrary to nat-
ural right," so do we. But is the world
agreed on this point? The Court must cer-
tainly refer to some standard. In the world
then agreed on this point? In the absence of
express legislation, the English and French
Courts and our own, have held that a slave
ought not to be returned to his prison-house.
But the writers on Jurisprudence maintain
that a law to return him, if made, "is no en-
croachment on the rights of the fugitive, for
no stranger has any just claim to the protec-
tion of a foreign State against its will, and
each State has a right to determine who may
come to reside or seek shelter within its lim-
its."

Such was the opinion of Shaw, even
in his noble judgment in the *Med Case*—
one of the best, the distinguished English Judge,
in an equally famous case in the annals of
Liberty, 9. B. & C. 468. Mr. Spooner him-
self has just told us that the true meaning
of the Slave-Trade clause of the Constitu-
tion is not that which expressly gives Con-
gress power, after a time, to destroy that
trade, but construction which secures to Con-
gress the power, after 1808, of prohibiting
any foreigner from landing on our soil.

What is this but an endorsement by Mr.
Spooner of the views of Judges Shaw and
Best, and the writers generally, that every
State may justly determine for herself who
shall seek shelter within her limits? It is
not so very evident that the verdict of the
world in general, would consider a clause
refusing slaves a shelter, as contrary to nat-
ural right. To what standard then shall the
Courts have recourse? To that of our na-
tional system of law? That has generally
been considered to sanction Slavery, and be-
fore we close we shall see if it does not ac-
tually do so. Its Ordinance of 1787, express-
ly orders the surrender of slaves. If it does,
of course, judged by that test, the Court
could not pronounce such a construction "bad"
in a legal sense.

In reply to Mr. Spooner's third point, then,
we say, let him show by the general tenor
of the world that the refusal of a sovereign
State to shelter slaves is contrary to natural
right. The Abolitionists think so. I wish
they were a majority—unfortunately they
are not—and the verdict of the world in general
is against them.

Certainly the case is not one where, in the
language of Chief Justice Marshall, "the ob-
servancy and justice is so manifest, that all
the world would, without hesitation, unite in
repealing it," and such it must be before the
Court will feel justified in disregarding the

Pennsylvania, then held in a modified Slave-ry created by recent laws.

That the clause does not relate to obligations growing out of contract is evident from this, that elsewhere (Art. 1, Sec. 10) the States are forbidden to interfere with or annul contracts. To interpret this clause as relating to contracts would make it mere repetition and superfluity.

Judged, then, by the usage of 1788, the term "held to service and labor" does aptly describe the condition of a slave, and is the phraseology usually employed for that purpose. This is our answer to Mr. Spooner on this point.

Lastly, "under the laws thereof," Mr. Spooner says this implies constitutional laws. He is right. We shall discuss this under our last division.

W. P.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Corrections.

To our last article.—It is ludicrous to say of the legislation of thirteen States, all of which had held slaves till within seven years, and twelve of which still hold them, "should read, 'until held them,'"—meaning in 1787—as all then held slaves but Massachusetts.

Again: "There never was a State which took account of aliens," &c. should read "took any special account," &c.—W. P.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Gov. Briggs—Western Liberty Party—Annual Meeting.

DANVERS, MASS., April 8, 1847.

DEAR FRIENDS:—

To-day is Governor Briggs's Fast Day.—I don't know of any person who should fast if he should not, if fasting would do any good in the way of atoning for sin, or propitiating the Divine favor and forgiveness. A minister told me the other evening I ought not to be suffered to speak against the Governor as I did—one of the very best men in the church or commonwealth. I told him he might be one of the best men in the church, but that I feared this was paying him a very doubtful compliment after all.

Governor Briggs has been doing his utmost to raise men to murder the Mexican people; committing at the most infernal measures to enlist them; appealing to their "patriotism and humanity"; "getting them drunk"; telling the most devilish lies to them about the pay the soldiers receive; bribing ruffians with a fee, for all the poor fools they can instigate, drunk or sober, into the fangs of the government; forcing some away, at the point of the bayonet, who, on getting sober, repented their folly, or who, not having received the bounty, had to leave home almost naked, and their families more destitute still. All this has the Governor been doing, or committing, besides volunteering to commission the myrmidons they call "officers," and then in his Fast Day Proclamation, with most unblushing effrontery, he says:

"Covering ourselves with humility as with a garment, let us devoutly entreat God to put an end to the war now existing between our own and a sister Republic, and pray that the time may come when His Word shall go forth that the sword shall cease to kill."

No wonder he thinks it time to do something to procure the favor of Infinite Justice. To go one day, all hands of us, without our dinners to please God, and to get him to undo the mischief we are so greedily doing.—To get him to set up a grand blacksmith's shop, and beat the swords and bayonets we are forging to murder with, into ploughshares and pruning-hooks. Let George N. Briggs and his clan go without their dinners if they think it will do any good. I shall do no such thing, that is if I can get anything to eat—which will not be easily done a great while if he, and such as he, sit at the helm of government much longer. Men sin like demons, and then think to escape repentance or punishment by abstaining a day now and then from their regular meals—a marvellous God have they, truly.

I see the Cincinnati Herald, with its usual fairness, refuses to publish Stephen S. Foster's letter. For one I am glad of it.—It reveals the character of Western Liberty Party—LIBERTY PARTY!! When Frederick Douglass, William A. White and others returned a year or two ago from the West, they told us the party was not as base and corrupt as it was here in New England.—We believed or rather hoped it was true.—They had been kindly greeted by the party, and had even received aid and co-operation to some extent, from its most active supporters. And they believed the party acted in all sincerity, and so reported. Consequently when the Fosters and others began to unmask them, and to hold up their hypocrisy and depravity, even some of our friends here deemed us unnecessarily severe. But they are revealing themselves. Let them refuse a few more communications, and they are welcome to all the respect they can command in New England.

I hope to see a delegation from Ohio at the annual meeting in New York, next month. That ought to be the largest and most enthusiastic meeting ever held by our Society.—The screaming horrors of the Mexican butchery—the streaming blood of ten thousand innocent men slain—the wailing of orphans, the weeping of widows, the violation of woman's virtue, the smelting furnaces, the guano fumes, and all the desolations of Mexico, mingle with the woe of the slave, and whirl together like a tempest up to heaven demanding vengeance. Such is our crisis. God expects every man to do his duty in it.

Yours as ever,

PARKER PILLSBURY.

Orthodox Slanders.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

Since my withdrawal from the Wesleyan Church, and identifying myself with the Anti-Slavery Society, I have received quite a number of letters, many of which I am utterly unable to answer for want of time.—Not a few of them contain charges against the American Society, which if the parties do not know to be false, they have been grossly imposed upon. I will, with your permission, insert a part of one letter, and make such remarks upon it as I may deem necessary. This will perhaps answer a better end, than a mere private letter could to each of the parties, as it will reach many others who are laboring under similar impressions.

Yours, &c.,

J. W. WALKER.

TO BROTHER WALKER.

VERY DEAR SIR:—

I received a notice from you "to Wesleyans and others" in the Anti-Slavery Bugle of last week, which sent a thrill of grief and sorrow through my old callous heart, which I do not remember to have felt in all my life before, and pray God that I may never feel again, unless his own most glorious exaltation, by some means, be thereby promoted. And now my dear brother can surely hear with me a little, when I assure him that this broken scroll is none other than the fruits of unfeigned love, and sincere regard, both for yourself and God's general Zion, particularly the infant branch, which we have both been laboring to sustain, and which will most deeply and seriously feel the shock produced by your withdrawal from the connexion. Think not my beloved brother that I say these things to censure you, far be that from me; but as I do think my dear sir, that you have been deceived, and thus led to embrace error, and give your support to a system which you would not for your right hand, nay, even for your life, if you viewed it as I do. I cannot feel justified in the sight of God, nor exercise that love for my brother which I have for myself, without making, at least, one effort to undeceive you, and more especially as I came very near myself splitting upon the same rock which I think my dear brother W. has stumbled upon; I seem to hear my Master say, "since thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."

When I first heard the American Anti-Slavery lecturers, I hardly knew what to think or what to say. I could not then contradict the charges which they brought against the Churches, both ministers and members, without distinction. I knew that religion, as a general thing, at the present day, was quite too superficial a matter, and almost came to the conclusion that I must withdraw all connexion and support from every ecclesiastical body which exists among us; but upon more deliberate consideration of the subject, I became convinced that what little there is of morality and virtue, or in short, of good principle, in the world, as a general thing, is to be found in the Church; and at length, by examining the matter closely, and prayerfully, reading their own publications, (I subscribed for the Bugle one year) and hearing them lecture repeatedly, I became convinced, that although their anti-slavery principles were good, the abolition of slavery was not their chief object; but to spread the awful desolating, moral pestilence of infidelity far and wide. Oh my brother, my dear brother, is there not some proof of this in the fact, that their combined efforts are levelled against every organization both civil and religious? (notwithstanding they often deny this, yet it can be proved,) and what do they substitute in the room of all this? nothing but anti-slavery—good indeed in its place—but which does not know that this is not every thing! Is it not striking the axe at the root of everything of a moral and religious nature, in short, everything that cements mankind to each other, by ties of the holiest, purest kind? Does it not when carried out, by some of them at least, break down even the sacred enclosure of the domestic circle; I mean by performing a sort of (a mock) ceremony between themselves, amounting to about this, "that they enter into a written contract to perform all duties growing out of the marriage relation so long as they shall be satisfied with each other." I do not see much that is ominous of good for our nation, more than they; but I do think their (almost) every effort is strongly calculated to sweep away the last particle of hope that remains for us as a nation; and if their principles could be carried out, I know not how we could look for anything better than the same principles produced in Infidel France in her worst days—and instead of the corrupt state of our government, (or even Constitution) and churches, being any reason why we should abandon all into the hands of the wicked and vile, I think it the very reason that should unite our hearts and efforts the more closely together, as union is strength, and not be less wise in matters of such vast importance, than we are in our common every day affairs of life; and surely we should think any one very unwise, who would destroy his house because it was poor, before he had provided another shelter; and yet conscientiousness is for sweeping away with a stroke all organizations, (except the American Anti-Slavery Society) both civil and religious, thus throwing off all restraint, and opening wide every avenue, that infidelity may sweep over the length and

breadth of the land. From such a state may God save us as individuals, as communities, as a nation! my soul says Amen, and Amen!

[REPLY.]

DEAR FRIEND:—

You will excuse my seeming neglect for the reason assigned in my note to the Editor of the Bugle. You will also excuse me from referring to anything merely personal, from the fact that I think, nothing of a personal character merely would be interesting to the readers of the columns through which I address you.

I thank you for the deep interest you seem to take in the welfare of those whom you look upon as erring brethren. You think I have been deceived and led to embrace error, dangerous, soul-killing error. That I have split upon a rock, upon which yourself well might have become thus involved, then of course all who have done the same, are in the same danger. Let us look at this matter for a moment. What have we done? What fearful sentiments have we embraced? Heresy, and give heed. We have received a matter of fact, as true!! That the Constitution of the U. S. is a pre-slavery document. In doing this we have done, what the Executive, Judicial and Legislative departments of the government of the country have done from the first hour of their existence, till the present: as also the whole body of the people, if we except a few who deny a plain matter of fact, for party purposes. And which seems to us the only safe and consistent course of conduct. "NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS." This is the whole matter. Now for the life of me, I cannot see what there is in all this so alarming, that fills so many with agonizing fear, that would lead them to suffer amputation or martyrdom rather than believe.

But the difficulty is not here, the people are not thus alarmed at receiving what they all know to be true. It lies in a number of other matters, that have no more possible connexion with the American Anti-Slavery Society, than the parties who originate and circulate them have with decency and truth. You are not the only one who while hearing the agents of the A. A. S. were convinced of duty, and neglected to "add to their faith, courage."

You have become convinced that what morality, virtue, and good principle there is in the world, is in the church, as a general thing.—If you meant in the church of Jesus Christ, I should have no cause to differ with you. But this is not your meaning.—You mean in the organizations, called churches. I cannot suppose that you are of opinion that the Wesleyan church embraces all virtue, &c., but that the other churches have their share. I will not undertake to say what you mean by the above properties, "virtue," &c. But what true virtue there can be in churches who sell females for prostitution, who are constantly engaged in raising victims for Southern Seraglios, who forbid marriage to one-sixth of the whole people, and legalize wholesale adultery, I cannot tell. What morality there can be in churches who fellowship and endorse the christian character of the most black hearted thieves and pirates in the universe is a mystery, greater than "the mystery of Godliness." And as to "good principle" it must be a plentiful article, when we consider the men who compose the churches, the means they employ for their support, the gross and bitter calumnies they are constantly fabricating against every species of reform, and every class of reformers. If it be a fact that the virtue, &c., is in the churches, then the greatest churches have the most virtue, &c., and you in leaving the M. E. Church left one of the most virtuous, moral, and well principled churches in the world. You must see that in leaving so heavenly a society, you made a sad mistake, and should with humble penitence, seek once more admission to her fold. I wish to call your attention especially to a part of your letter, which I deem the most important, because it contains the most wide spread sentiments, at the same time the most unfounded slanders. You say you "have examined this matter closely and prayerfully." You "have read their publications and heard the lecturers repeatedly." "Their chief object is not the abolition of slavery, but to spread the awful desolating, moral pestilence of infidelity far and wide." Now my friend, I ask you, are you sure of the above? I also ask you for the evidence thro' the columns of this paper. I deny the whole in the most plain, positive and unequivocal manner. I call upon you or any other, who is in the habit of stating the above, to adduce the resolution, address, or statement of the Society in which christianity is assailed, or infidelity taught or advocated. I also call upon you to bring forward any article in any of the organs of the Society, or any sentence in any of the publications of the Society, that in any form teaches the desolating doctrine of infidelity—furthermore, I challenge you to prove that the agents of such Societies have ever on the anti-slavery platform advocated other than anti-slavery doctrines.

You ask "have we not evidence in the fact that their combined efforts are levelled against every organization, both civil and religious." Are you sure the Societies go against every organization? Where is the proof? I unequivocally deny this, as I have done the former. Point us to the action of the society where her hostility is thus expressed. The society has never uttered a word of condemnation against this or any other government only so far as they have cherished and sustained slavery.

So with religious organizations. If you have heard the agents of the American Society repeatedly, you have heard them declare that they had nothing to say against churches which were anti-slavery. This you know, and how you could declare what you have on this point, I don't know. I know the charge is brought against the American Society that they do not discriminate enough. I have heard it repeatedly. Every sect wishes to be an exception. I never heard the Wesleyans complain that the E. M. C. was not passed by without being charged with the crime of slavery. So with the rest. Would you have a lecturer pass by the parties who are guilty of their brother's blood, because, forsooth, the parties are guilty of a man-stealing government, or a cradle-plundering church?

I would exercise that charity which thinketh no evil, but it would be attempting to believe what is absolutely impossible, were I to think that a man could be honest who says the "American Society wish to sweep away at a stroke every organization" but their own. Do you not know that this is false? Why, man, you could hardly find a member of the A. A. S. S. but that belongs to half a dozen others, such as Peace, Temperance, Moral Reform, Anti Capital Punishment, and kindred ones. Yet you say they seek the overthrow of all save one. Beside, how many are these members of different Orthodox Churches? (not many I hope,) and even some are ministers in your own Church and Conference.

When I see or hear an otherwise decent man charging men and women of whom the world is not worthy, patterns of every virtue, living exemplifications of Gospel truth—with seeking to throw off every restraint, that they may revel in crime, I can only say, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." The above charge originated with a class of men than whom there can be none more vile and wicked; men who have ever been a curse to the best interests of humanity, whose sole object has been to enslave and fetter the mind, men who are generally too proud to beg and too idle to dig, who know that their place and living depend upon the ignorance and blindness of the people; the same class perpetuate these falsehoods that their own knavery may appear honesty, their hypocrisy sanctity.—They teach their willing dupes the inventions of their own corrupt minds, and do it with such a show of sanctity that even well-meaning men are "led to believe and place confidence in them. I can assure you I have been disappointed in this, and understand the character of the priesthood far better than yourself. I would for rather risk my present and eternal salvation with the parties you so deeply revile, than with nineteen-twentieths of the whole church and clergy.

One other point in your letter—your remarks on marriage. Who among the anti-slavery friends do away with marriage? who among them have a mock ceremony? Name the parties who sign a paper to the effect you say. The whole is a tissue of the blackest falsehood. Adduce your proof? You have mistaken the whole matter. It is Protestant Orthodoxy you have been describing—the Sunday religion of your own country you have been portraying. Your own religion won't allow the sixth part of the people even to sign a paper that they will discharge the duties of the marriage relation as long as they are satisfied with each other. They must unite at the will of their pious masters, and separate at their bidding. Your godly ministers and members may not only have one wife but as many concubines as they can afford to keep; and yet you cry out against anti-slavery men, and say they are opposed to marriage.

I don't believe a man is a christian that retails such falsehoods as your letter contains.—I don't believe a man is the friend of the slave who will try thus to blast the character of the slaves' friends. No matter what his profession, I have no confidence in him.—"By their fruits ye shall know them."—Priests, members, and anti-slavery agents have been frequently at my house for days together, and I know that in true Christian deportment there is no comparison. I am sorry to have occupied so much space.

Yours for the slandered,

J. W. WALKER.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

My heart burns with liveliest sympathy with you, in the noble theme of emancipation; and though not personally acquainted with you, yet I request the privilege, through the Bugle, of giving a note of response to those who ask my reasons for disfellowshipping the Disciples of W.—I deem it my duty, not only to myself and the truth, but to Jesus Christ, for whose sake I have forsaken father and mother, brethren and friends.

I have long been convinced that slavery and war are the blackest of all sins, and the sum of all villainies, and consequently, necessitate the participants in them are the chief of sinners.

After weighing all arguments, pro and con, I came to an irresistible conviction, that it is the duty of every Christian to come out from among them, and renounce all fellowship with the perpetrators of such gross inhumanity. I come to this conclusion from a two-

fold reason. 1st, I hear the positive command of God in language not to be mistaken—and 2d, so long as I admit a slaveholder or warmaker can be a Christian, so long I admit slavery and war are not sinful; for all who sin wilfully are sinners, and I cannot see how a man can be a Christian and sinner at the same time.

A minority in the church justify slavery, and he that justifies the wicked "is abomination to the Lord." One member says she wishes the slaves "liberated," not by being set free, but by having a plenty to eat and wear, and not being whipped often! Another is afraid of negroes; and a third thinks they ought not to be treated as whites, because they "look so awful," &c. Nearly all the members of the church legalize slavery and war, and many say they would fight for their country, if invaded. They hold the Bible in their hands, and loudly profess to be its only true exponents and followers;—while they unblushingly deny its heavenly principle, and volunteer to protect the "honor" of their country by plunging the sword into the hearts of their own brethren.

Jesus taught the grand and heavenly doctrine of physical non-resistance. The church, by the mouth of her bishops and teachers, says she would turn a man out of doors who taught non-resistance, thus declaring that she will reject the King of Heaven. Yea, I doubt not but if Jesus should again come to earth, many of his professed followers would cry "away with him," for they now reject his principles, and dishonor his name in the person of his disciples.

I believe that when Christians become parties to human laws, they become "wise above what is written," violate the law of God, and justly subject themselves to church censure. I presume the editors of the Bugle will not agree with me here; for the doctrine is new, but fast gaining ground among the faithful. An ecclesiastical, political church is nothing but veiled Popery—the non-prophets of the veil, the nominal Christians the Pope, each with a double set of rules, one to obey themselves, the other to defend the faith with, for they tell us God will never protect Christians without we have a civil law, but the wicked will put them to death! This is the church Babylon, the beast upon which she sits, the political power upon which she relies for protection, instead of the arm of God.

In renouncing the political churches, I do not renounce the cause of Christ; but for His sake leave them, because I cannot be restrained and bound down in obedience.—The severest pangs I ever felt were endured when I contemplated disfellowshipping the Disciples; for the idea of separating called on the thousand ties that for years bound us together. I leave them that my influence may be on the side of truth, and not with the oppressor. There are many honest men and women among them, who, I hope, will come to see the truth and embrace it, for I have seen them tremble like Felix before the truth and promise to investigate it.

I am aware that I am regarded by many as fanatical, foolish, insane, &c., but I prefer these unjust accusations to the friendship of the world, which is enmity against God.—I could easily float along on the tide of popularity, were I to resist my convictions; but I prefer to bear the buffetings of adversity, an unswerving conscience, and the smile of an approving God, to all that wealth can purchase or hypocrisy secure. Yours truly,

ELLEN.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, APRIL 23, 1847.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chestnut sts.

Col. Cilley—The Liberty Party.

The Liberty party papers have had much to say of late about Colonel Cilley. The Signal of Liberty remarks that the Era and Emancipator have at last given him up.—But why, we ask, should they desert him because in Washington city, in a slaveholding atmosphere, and in the Senate Chamber at that, where he had been sent to sit down upon terms of equality with slaveholders—acknowledging them as proper persons to legislate in common with himself upon the interests of the people and of the country, he could not stand up under these circumstances, surrounded by such influence, and act like a man. Poor fellow! he quailed before the Southern overbearingness of his slaveholding associates in the Senate Chamber. The Granite Freeman, however, appears to stand by the Colonel, and vindicate him from these assaults. It says, in amount, that Col. Cilley, in making his (famous, but extremely silly) speech in the Senate, spoke rather as Colonel Cilley than as Senator Cilley, and, in saying this, the editor of the Freeman, no doubt, unwittingly spoke more truth than he intended. A military man, every one knows, is a mere machine at best, and a machine created for bloody purposes at that; but a piece of machinery that fits any where is the greater machine of a political party—hence he was

not out of his place as a Liberty party Senator.

But the editor of the Era is in that same slaveholding atmosphere, surrounded by some of the influences which were brought to bear upon Col. Cilley. How soon the Liberty press may desert him for his tameness in the presence of the bloody monster, we know not; but if he should be forsaken by the anti-slavery men of the country, he is winning golden opinions at the South, and will have some friends left to lean upon. As evidence of the favorable opinion formed of him in the South, read the following, from the Cincinnati Herald, with its quotation from the Christian Intelligencer, of Virginia:

THE NATIONAL ERA.

The following editorial notice from the Christian Intelligencer, a religious paper, published in Virginia, shows that Dr. Bailey, guided by the suggestions of his own good sense and excellent temper, in spite of the sneers of those who judge of a man's efficiency by the noise he makes, and who, always prating about the Divine power of Love, are really filled with nothing else than love of themselves, in reaching in the most effectual manner, the minds of intelligent and conscientious men in the Slaveholding States:

"THE NATIONAL ERA."—This is the title of an interesting paper, published at Washington city, D. C. It is edited by Dr. G. Bailey, former editor of the Cincinnati Herald. Dr. Bailey's paper is a great improvement upon the publications of the Abolitionists. There is no abuse nor slander of Southern slaveholders; nor any disposition evinced to do injustice to any one. How far the locality of the Doctor may influence him, we undertake not to say, but we are fully persuaded that he is pursuing the only course that can exempt him from danger. Indeed we did not suppose that the establishment of an anti-slavery paper at Washington, would have been peaceably acquired in, but there seems to be no indication of a disposition to deny him the privilege, which all claim, of publishing his opinions upon politics, morals and religion. We are glad that it has so turned out. For our part we are in favor of free and full discussion. Truth has nothing to fear, and controversy is to be deprecated only when conducted in an improper manner.

Two things are worthy of remark in the above. One is in reference to the remarks of the Intelligencer. We must take into account what it is that slaveholders consider slander and abuse of themselves. They consider it a slander to call them sinners and criminals, and abuse to treat them as such.—Hence Dr. Bailey's paper is a great improvement, in their opinion, "upon the publications of the Abolitionists," as they do take that position. The other is the remark of the Herald, which, we suppose, is intended for the uncompromising Abolitionists, and really we think that the editor of the Herald's sling at the abolitionists is much more severe than anything we hear him say against slaveholders.—S.

The Anniversary Meeting.

This important meeting, commencing on Tuesday the 11th of May, will, without doubt, be largely attended. The Anti-Slavery Standard contains the following:

THE ANNUAL MEETING.—By the advertisement in this week's paper, it will be observed, that the elegant and spacious Hall, known as the Apollo Saloon, has been engaged for the various meetings of the Society at its annual meeting. The anniversary meeting will be in the Tabernacle, on Tuesday morning. In the afternoon of that day, and on the whole of the two succeeding days the meetings will be held in the Apollo Saloon.

We are glad to learn from the Liberator that Frederick Douglass was to sail from England on the 4th inst., and will, no doubt, be present at the annual meeting. Our friends, Messrs. Quincy, Garrison, Pillsbury, Phillips, the Posters, and others from Massachusetts, are expected to be at the meetings, as well as the entire corps of lecturing agents now laboring in this State, with it, is hoped, a large representation from Central and Western New York. Benjamin S. Jones, J. W. Walker, and Samuel Brooke, will, we trust, bring with them a large delegation from Ohio. Philadelphia, and the neighboring counties, never fail to be well represented.

Exchange papers will oblige us by noticing the time and place of the meetings.

B. S. and J. E. Jones are now in Philadelphia, and will attend. J. W. Walker, we are happy to announce, will also be there. The meeting must be one of thrilling interest.

Correction.

Last week we published a letter from N. N. Solby, in which we discovered a typographical error too late for correction. The error occurred in this sentence: "I think it too late in the day for reformers to give a willing support to a slaveholding, war-making and neck-breaking government." The error was in making him say 'law-making,' instead of 'war-making.'

An error also occurred in the last article on the 2d page, where 'morning' was printed, 'warning.'

Change of Address.

J. W. WALKER's address is Leesville, Carroll county, Ohio.

C. W. LEFFINGWELL's address is Ravenscroft, Portage county, Ohio. Liberator please notice.

THE WESTERN A. S. FAIR.—Last week we added the name of Susanna E. Donaldson of New Richmond to the Call. This week we add the name of Rebecca S. Thomas of Marlborough.

We receive much encouragement in regard to this enterprise from many different quarters, and we hope that no neighborhood will neglect to send its contributions.

War and Warriors.

BY JOHN B. BEACH—NO. V.

"Great men are not always wise."

BIBLE.

Those who were at pains to read our last article, will remember that we were dwelling upon one of the prominent evils of war, viz: its terrible destruction of human life. We adduced some important facts from history, showing what vast numbers have fallen upon the field. We spoke of the other means of destruction ever attendant upon the system—of the famine, the pestilence, and the fire—of the privations, exposures and hardships that necessarily sweep off soldiers in vast multitudes, and of the widows that have been made, and the orphans that have perished from its barbarities.

But perhaps some are ready to exclaim, "all this is ancient warfare." Very true—and what, I ask, is modern warfare but "a chip from the old block?" It is of a piece throughout—the devil's work from beginning to end.

Truly fewer men now fall upon the field of battle than formerly—for our muskets, and howitzers, and cannon, our forts, and batteries, and war-ships, our bombs, and rockets, and grenades, decide an engagement far more summarily than the lingering mode of olden time. But this very generation has witnessed the slaughter of nations and the depopulation of provinces. France it has seen shorn of her first-born, by a more terrible visitant than ever moved over the land of the Nile. England, Spain, Holland, Belgium, Germany, Prussia and Austria—in short, almost the whole Continent, from the Channel to the city of the Czars—it has seen decimated by the Moloch of war. The thunders of conflict it has heard booming over the valleys, lakes and seas of both hemispheres. Its tale is of Copenhagen, Erie, Champlain, Trafalgar—of Borodino, Leipsic, Austerlitz, New Orleans, Waterloo. It came upon the stage amid the crash of falling empires and the din of belligerent States. The notes of battle, caught up from old Atlantic's bosom, echoed back by Gibraltar's eternal granite from the old world to the new, still linger in its ears. In 1812 it saw in six months alone a million of men perish on a single campaign. It has canonized one of the most sanguinary human butchers that ever trod the world's stage—that iron-hearted Anarch, who for fifteen years ranged over Europe like the Death Angel, overwhelmed the earth's grandest Empires in a single battle, and grimly boasted, "I can afford ten thousand men a day!" The old civil structures of the Continent trembled on their foundations when he appeared. Governments were demolished before him, dynasties overthrown, kingdoms and states removed from the busy theatre of affairs with all the rapidity of the drama. War was to him like his favorite game of chess—Europe was his field of action; Kings, Emperors, Marshalls, Princes and Prelates, his puppets. But his vivid career was cut short by a hand mightier than his own. After trampling upon the necks of rulers, and clambering over the wrecks of fallen States, till he reached a height from which he looked down on all the crowned heads of the old World, he died—died a captive—died amid the desolate crags of Helena. Twenty-five years ago that rock-bound isle was visited by a storm. The ocean roared, and the wild winds moaned in the valleys; the thunder bellowed among the hills, and the lightning bolts crashed through the rocking forest. In the voice of the raging elements his warlike spirit, fast ebbing on the bed of death, "heard the old echoes of battle." "The last words on his lips were of war; 'Te Deum' was uttered in his dream—and he died. The fiery spirit passed away, like Cronwell's, in a storm!" Then followed he those six millions of wretched ghosts that he had despatched before him to the spirit land. Nor at the close of his eventful course did the work of destruction cease. "During only twelve years of the recent war of Europe alone," I am authorized to affirm, "not less than 5,800,000 Christian lives are supposed to have been lost."

Few persons are aware of the extent to which war have been waged within the last quarter of a century. It has been styled the period of general Peace, but during the whole of it the massive gates of the world's War Temple, Janus-like, have stood ajar. All the nations of Christendom have thronged these grim courts, each bringing her horrid hecatomb; and libations of human blood have incessantly steamed up from those brazen altars.

About the commencement of 1821, the storm of Revolution broke out in Greece—"On Suli's rock and Parga's shore" the Argive sword clashed with the Turkish scimitar. For nine long years that hardy race stood firm against the Ottoman power; and for nine long years the land of classic memory was defaced by pillage and decimated by slaughter. But at length the Autocrat of the North stretched forth his arm; the Pacha of Egypt followed up the advantage, and Greece, through the tardy interference of foreign powers, at last obtained rest.

During the same time France was waging an exterminating war against Algeria, and terrible convulsions were shaking the Republic of the South. Next followed (in 1830,) the civil conflict in France, which brought

her present sovereign to the throne; also during the same year the Poles commenced an unhappy struggle for independence with the most powerful despotism of the East—a struggle which turned the granary of Europe into a wide desolation, and drenched its soil with the blood of peasantry and nobles. Here, too, we date the outbreak of the sanguinary Revolution of Texas, which has since entailed upon our own Government a clinging and malignant curse.

Much about this period the notes of civil discord were sounding across the waters from Spain; and for years the public prints were rife with intelligence respecting a most revolting warfare carried on in the very heart of the country with a cold blooded atrocity scarcely paralleled in the annals of barbaric States. Partial tranquility has since been restored; but Spain even now sleeps like a villa on the side of a volcano.

Then followed our notorious Florida War, in which \$6,000,000 of revenue and many human lives were expended, as a distinguished Statesman has said, "in fighting five hundred invisible Indians!" The Canadian revolt next raged on our frontier; and simultaneously Mexico became embroiled with France. Before these difficulties were adjusted, England had commenced waging that detested "Opium War" upon 350,000,000 of unoffending Chinese; than which none more basely sordid or of blacker infamy stand on record. At this period also Italy was the seat of rebellion, and frequent scenes of carnage were transpiring in the Rhenish Provinces. Soon after France and Morocco came to hostilities, and horrible massacres occurred on the Isle of St. Domingo. Russia also made repeated but unsuccessful attempts to subdue the wild hordes of Caucasus. Then comes the butchery of the Sikhs in India by the British arms, and solemn thanksgiving offered up on Easter Sunday in the Church of the Establishment for two of the most inhuman and complete massacres history ever chronicled.

Last on the scroll of infamy stands our own Mexican war; begun in sheer wickedness, carried on at the expense of property and principle, and (whether it prove successful or otherwise,) certain to plunge the Government in irretrievable disgrace. The war of the Greeks and the revolt of the Poles, though unquestionably impolitic, are nevertheless justified by many reasonable men, because they were a struggle of free against despotic principles, a rising of the public mind in defence of a great idea, a war of changeless Right against high-handed wrong. We find some palliation in the attack of France on Algiers, for she thereby succeeded in breaking up that old den of pirates. Even a war of ambition has some redeeming elements in the estimation of those who rate highly what they are pleased to call "the war-like virtues." But a Slaveholder's war who can tolerate? A war clearly designed to prepare an area for the more complete and permanent establishment of despotic, unchristian principles, what friend of humanity can uphold? A war in which a successful issue is unmingled calamity to Republicanism and universal Liberty, what Patriot—what Philanthropist can but deprecate and abhor! But notwithstanding all our individual reprobation, indignation and abhorrence, as a nation we are carrying on war—a Slaveholder's war. There's no denying that. For twelve months or more our troops have been invading a soil they have no right to tread, and revenue by scores of millions, and human lives by the thousand have paid the heavy forfeit. You and I may see the stupid folly and the treasurableness of all this; but the war still goes on, and we come in for a share of its rich legacy of taxes and its exhaustless revenue of national infamy.

* Witness the following sketch: "This battle had begun at six, and was over at eleven o'clock; the hand-to-hand combat commenced at nine, and lasted scarcely two hours.—The river was full of sinking men. For two hours, volley after volley was poured in upon the human mass, the stream being literally red with blood, and covered with the bodies of the slain. At last, the musket ammunition being exhausted, the infantry fell to the rear, the horse artillery plying grape, till not a man was visible within range. NO COMPASSION WAS FELT OR MERCY SHOWN." What a scene for God and Angels to look upon!

From the Liberator.

Spirit of Liberty Party.

The article we have copied on our first page, from the *Western Citizen*, exhibits the spirit which generally pervades the Liberty party towards those who stand on the old anti-slavery platform, and adhere to the American Anti-Slavery Society.

It professes to show the cause of the divisions in the anti-slavery ranks, and to give an accurate description of the views of the two classes of abolitionists; but, whether from ignorance or design, it deals in caricature and misrepresentation, and is therefore calculated to enlighten no one, but may deceive many.

In the first place, the attempt to classify the old organized abolitionists as non-resistants is highly disingenuous. What would be thought of our fairness, if because James G. Birney is a Presbyterian, we should designate the Liberty party as a Presbyterian party? With the question of non-resistance, abolitionists as such, have no more to do than they have with Presbyterianism. We aver, for the hundredth time, that the American Anti-Slavery Society has never entertained that question, nor taken any action upon it, any more than the American Bible or Tract Society; nor has any of its auxiliaries; nor has the organ of that Society, the *Standard*, meddled with it. Why, then, this fresh re-

petition of an old and stale falsehood! Why, not to gratify a malicious spirit! We tell the editor of the *Western Citizen*, that his classification is an untruthful one, and that he is grossly deceiving his readers. "Garrisonian abolitionism" is one thing, taking cognizance in its official action of nothing but the question of slavery. "Garrison non-resistance" is another thing, not hostile to the former, (would to God that all mankind did, and carried it into practice!) therefore it is just to charge all those who are associated with us for the overthrow of slavery with being non-resistants, as absurd as it is in violation of the truth. The Liberator is not, and never has been, the organ of any society whatever. We represent nobody but ourselves. We are connected by membership with the Anti-Slavery Society, and with the Non-Resistance Society; but we have never sought to violate, nor encouraged the violation, of the bond which unites us with either of those Societies. We challenge any man to say when and where we have endeavored to get our non-resistance views endorsed by any anti-slavery convention or society. It cannot be done. We have been faithful and true to our anti-slavery pledge, and have not allowed the "extraneous" question of non-resistance to be mingled with our anti-slavery action. There never has been a Society in the world, that has not steadily and consistently pursued its one great object, or more carefully avoided the blending of questions with it, than the American Anti-Slavery Society. Its Constitution and its test of membership have remained the same from the beginning. Whoever believes that slavery is, under all circumstances, a sin against God, and ought to be immediately abolished, can, at any time, become a member of it; and the same thing is true of all its auxiliaries. Yet, from the representation of the editor of the *Citizen*, a person ignorant of these facts (which he is not) would naturally conclude, that the American A. S. Society is a Non-Resistance Society, and that none but non-resistants are allowed to become members of it!—While, on the other hand, another Liberty party writer (William Goodell) is rebuking that Society for the laxity of its test, and representing it as welcoming to its embrace, pro-slavery partisans and sectarians to an extent!! Both of these accusers bearing false witness against it.

But of what avail will be this refutation of ours, so far as the people of Michigan are concerned! We doubt whether the editor of the *Citizen* will have the fairness to lay it before his readers, in our own words. Yet we have copied his defamatory article into our columns, without mutilation or abridgement. We shall be agreeably disappointed, if he admits this rejoinder into his paper. If he is an honest man, he will do so.

His account of the division in the anti-slavery ranks is equally at variance with the truth. He speaks of certain laborers in the cause who "took the glory to themselves, when God should have been glorified"; but who those impious persons were, he does not specify. It is much "easier to deal in cant of this kind, to stab by insinuation, than to substantiate false accusations by an array of evidence." "Garrison was the god of the anti-slavery host." This sentence reveals the eleven feet. "Our crime was in having won the love and confidence of the 'host' alluded to, (not a very numerous one,) by our fidelity to principle, and undeviating regard for the cause, that green-eyed jealousy and priestly cunning essayed in vain to effect our banishment, by protesting against 'man-worship,' and representing that the cause ought to be entrusted to the care of better hands, those of bigots and sectarians!" Division followed as the consequence. Let us see. This division took place at the anniversary in May, 1840. Up to that time, (and let this fact never be forgotten,) the management of the American Anti-Slavery Society had been committed to the men who subsequently lifted their heels against it—the Tappans, Birney, Leavitt, Wright, Stanton, &c., &c.—For its executive action, they were responsible. Why then did they secede? Certainly not for any thing that the Society had done, for it had been entirely under their control. What private griefs they had; we will not stop to inquire; but let no false issue be made—let us keep to the record. The President of the Society, pro tem—FRANCIS JACKSON of Boston—nominated ABRAHAM KELLEY as a member of one of the committees. To meet a simple and inoffensive case like this, the Orthodox clergy, with their tools, came up from various parts of the land in formidable array; and it was made by them a test question. They were outraged, and instantly seceded in great wrath, and formed a hostile organization. Yes, the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society was organized for the sole reason, (at least no other issue was made,) that *Abby Kelley* was placed upon a committee—she whose character was spotless, a member of the Society of Friends, one of the most self-denying and efficient friends of the slave whom God has raised up in all Christendom! She was a woman—that constituted her crime, and made her election just cause for seeking the utter overthrow of the American Anti-Slavery Society! Will the editor of the *Citizen* lay this statement, (which no man can invalidate,) before his readers, that they may understand, that if a dislike of "man-worship" had any thing to do with the division of the anti-slavery host, it is a just and reasonable ground for secession? Truly, a just and reasonable ground for secession!

He compliments the seceders as having taken "the consistent, straight-forward course of enlightened reformers." (!) Let us see. Those who continued to adhere to the old Parent Society, "that they fell into an extreme ultra, fanatical position," and exhibited "an erratic, self-willed and ungovernable manifestation of the reformatory spirit; the devil attempting to guide and urge on to destruction the reform which he could not check." Now, it is not difficult to make representations of this kind; and as they are put forth, unsustained by a particle of evidence, we shall here simply declare them to be wholly devoid of truth—leaving the editor of the *Citizen* to choose his own time when he will measure weapons with us in the form of documentary evidence. We call for chapter and verse. The records of the American Anti-Slavery Society are open for inspection. What has it done to warrant an assault like this!

"The leading feature of the non-resistance of Garrisonian abolitionism is destruction." Destruction of what? Not of any good institution—for it has no warfare with goodness—but of whatever institutions and upholds slavery. "The leading feature of the non-resistance of Liberty party is regeneration."—Regeneration of what? Not of the Whig and Democratic parties, certainly; for it declares a war of extermination against them, and so is unappeasably 'destructive.' A fair specimen of his every day consistency! Regeneration of the church! How? By maintaining that a pro-slavery church is the church of Jesus Christ, nevertheless; and fiercely denouncing as 'infidels,' those who maintain the contrary doctrine! Regeneration of the clergy! How? By assuring them that they shall be recognized and sustained as the true ministers of Christ—though if they are connected with the Whig or Democratic party, they shall not be deemed worthy by their Liberty party supporters of receiving a solitary vote to fill even the humblest office in the gift of the people!—Regeneration of the government! How? By making "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell"—by making "lies their refuge, and under falsehood hiding themselves."! This plea of regeneration is a hollow one, raised to screen a pro-slavery clergy, a pro-slavery church, and a pro-slavery government, from the application of the very doctrine that the Liberty party lays down, in regard to an instant withdrawal of all abolitionists from the Whig and Democratic parties—the doctrine of "come-outism!"

Liberty partyism, we are gravely told, 'is based upon the conclusion, that slavery is fundamentally a moral and social evil, though created by law.' This is capital nonsense. Law may sanction immorality, but to create it is beyond its power. Slavery was prior to the law, and made the law; hence it is impossible for that which is created to give birth to the creator.

Again, we are told, that Liberty partyism 'does not infer that God does not recognize the order of the ministry; it cannot believe that the Sabbath was not ordained of God.' We should like to know whether the Liberty party has undertaken to endorse 'the order of the ministry,' and the holiness of 'the Sabbath,' as is here intimated. We had supposed that that party was composed of persons brought together without reference to any such questions; and widely various in their religious opinions; but, it seems, it has a theological as well as an anti-slavery test!

From the True West.

A Horrible Story.

The following story is too bad almost for publication, yet the truth should be told.—The writer is a minister of the M. E. Church, and gives his proper name, so that if he is called in question, the reader will know where the responsibility belongs.

Dear Brother Lee—

A few years since, one of my neighbors, while descending the Mississippi river in a flat-boat, on landing at a plantation, witnessed a most revolting scene of cruelty, which he related in substance as follows:

A female slave was at work in a field, where she was compelled to keep her infant child, that was sick and hungry. The poor mother was pained at seeing her little babe sick and starving, and obeying the holy dictates of a mother's feelings, she dug two potatoes from her master's potato ground, and roasted them in a fire near where she labored, and gave them to her suffering infant.

For this offence she was stripped entirely naked, and bound with a cord, and beaten almost to death! The narrator approached the scene of cruelty, and begged the monster, with tears, to desist, but he was answered only with bitter curses. He continued to beat her in a most cruel manner, cutting her back, limbs, and breasts, with his lashes, until her milk from her breasts mingled with her blood and ran down to the ground, filling little holes near where she stood. In the midst of this heart-rending scene, our friend became so excited that he ran forward on the miserable murderer, and attempted to stop him by force. His men now interfered, and bore him off to his boat, or his interfering would have probably cost him his life.

Such hell-deserving cruelty occurs every day in the slave States. Thousands are lashed and beaten on their backs and limbs until they carry huge scars from childhood to their grave. Yet flowing blood and scalding tears, piteous groans and imploring looks, move not the steel hearts of their cruel oppressors.

The system that admits such cruelty is tolerated in many of the Christian Churches, (so called.) Ministers sanctify it from the pulpit, and endeavor to support it from the Bible—while thousands of professors uphold it at the ballot-box, and thus continue its existence by all these and various other means.

Now, my dear brethren, on with the armor of righteousness, and rush boldly into the battle. We are small beside Amalek; but "if God be for us, who can be against us!" "Truth is mighty, and shall prevail."

"Truly curious to witness the writings and contortions of pro-slavery men and slaveholders in the M. E. Church in this part of Ohio. Although it may surprise many of the friends of humanity, it is a fact that slaveholders live in this free State, and enjoy the privileges of the M. E. Church unmolested.

Yours truly,
D. H. WHEELER.
Pomeroy, Feb. 16.

Who will sell a Seamstress?—Who thinks that Northern seamstresses, making shirts at four or five cents a piece, would be benefited by being sold? What seamstress herself thinks so! Now is her time. Let her speak. The *Selma* (Alabama) Reporter, edited by a Methodist minister, has the following announcement under its editorial head:—*Chronotype.*

IMPORTANT.

Any person who has a good seamstress to dispose of, will please apply in the editor of this paper. A good price will be given, if she will suit.

Great Fire in Richmond, Ohio.

The alarm of fire last night was caused by the light of a great fire in Richmond, twenty miles up the river. The large distillery of Mr. Gibson—the largest in the West, was entirely consumed, with 10 or 12 residences. The fire was still raging, when our informant passed the town. The loss is immense, but cannot be ascertained with any degree of accuracy.—*Chronicle.*

A watchmaker being asked the age of his youngest child, said he "anted just a quarter to three."

Receipts.

Avery Brace, N. Manchester,	\$3.00-140
Pennock Bailey, Salem,	1.00-31
Eljah Whitney Thomas' Shop,	1.50-104
Elizabeth C. Strong, Benton,	1.50-107
John M. Davis, Danversville,	1.00-88
J. B. Cooley Fallston,	1.10-88
J. H. Davis, Pottersville,	1.00-86
Chas. Newton, Ellsworth,	96-86
John Dutton, New Garden,	1.50-104
John Pierce, Annapolis,	1.00-123
Chauncey Harman, Randolph,	75-109
A. Ramsay, Orlton,	75-76
T. C. Puchett, Winchester,	2.00-133
L. Lilly, Andover,	1.30-86
Elizabeth Peterson, Ravenna,	1.00-34
Ed. Matthews,	1.00-85
Calvin Belden, Farmington,	2.00-103
John Boyer, Bandysburg,	1.50-132
H. Wiley, Brunswick,	75-87
Levi Stokes, West Middleburg,	50
J. Crovell, Jay Court House,	1.50-119
Salem Green,	25-100
A. Moore, Ellsworth,	75-86
J. W. Church, Canfield,	1.00-80
John Wetmore,	25-113
Maria R. Ellis, Green's Fork,	1.00-124
Geo. W. Ward, Brunswick,	50-86
Joe. Cutler, Lodi,	1.00-98
H. F. Bassett, Berea,	1.00-99
J. McKisson, Northfield,	25-80
Edward Whitney, Fort Madison,	75-81
Joseph Hardman, Columbiana,	1.25-107

Please take notice, that in the acknowledgment of subscription money for the Bugle, not only is the amount received placed opposite the subscribers' name, but also the number of the paper to which he has paid, and which will be found in the outside column of figures.

WESTERN ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

It is proposed to hold a Fair, to aid the cause of emancipation, at the time and place of the next Anniversary of the Western Anti-Slavery Society; and the object of this Circular is to invite all, to assist in preparing for that occasion, who are the foes of oppression—who desire that our country shall be redeemed from the rule of tyrants—who wish to break the yoke of the captive, and to repel the aggressions which slavery is making upon our own rights. Whether the contributions shall be worthy of the cause, and the high professions of those who stand forth as the friends of liberty, may greatly depend, reader, upon your efforts. Are you willing to contribute of your abundance or your penny? are you willing to stimulate others to good works, and unite with them to bring your neighborhood offering, and lay it upon the altar of humanity? If you have neither silver nor gold, are you willing to consecrate a portion of what you do possess to this cause? Let the farmer and his wife bring grain and wool, brooms and baskets, cloth and other manufactured articles—let the dairymaid come with her cheese and butter, and the miller with his flour—let the hatter and the tinner, the saddler and shoe-maker present such useful things as their several handicrafts can furnish—let the merchant contribute liberally of his stock, and those who are skillful with the needle bring such useful and fancy articles as their ingenuity may devise.

The proceeds of this Fair will be appropriated to the support of the Anti-Slavery movement in the West, either by placing them at the disposal of the Western Anti-Slavery Society or applying them by direction of the donors to some branch of this reform in harmony with the views of that Society.

The cause for which we ask you to labor is one which is fraught with the deepest interest to millions of our race—it meets with favor from the virtuous and the good, and is approved by the Father of the oppressed.—We affectionately invite you to share the toil and the reward of this work—we appeal to you in the name of MAN, robbed and outraged—we ask you to be true to the instincts of your better nature, and to prove by your actions that you appreciate the blessings of liberty and the safe-guard of virtue.

BETSEY M. COWLES, Austintown, OHIO.
LYDIA IRISH, New Lisbon.
JANE D. McNEAL, Greene.
MARY DONALDSON, do.
MATILDA S. HOWELL, Painesville.
SUSAN MARSHALL, do.
MARIA L. GIDDINGS, Jefferson.
MERCY LLOYD, Lloydsville.
MARY ANN BRONSON, Medina.
PHEBE ANN CARROLL, Ravenna.
MARTHA J. TILDEN, do.
SUSANNA E. DONALDSON, New Richmond.
RUTH DUGDALE, Green Plain.
ELIZABETH BOSTON, Selma.
MARY WHITMORE, Andover.
REBECCA S. THOMAS, Marlborough.
SARAH BROWN, New Lyme.
ELIZA COWLES, Geneva.
ZILPAH BARNAVY, Mt. Union.
HARRIET N. TORREY, Parkman.
ELIZABETH A. STEEDMAN, Randolph.
CORDELLA SHALLEY, do.
ELIZABETH BUTTERWORTH, Hopkinsville.
ANN WALKER, Leesville.
MARY GRISWOLD, New Garden.
ELIZA HOLMES, Columbiana.
LEAH VOGLERSON, do.
ANNA C. FULLER, Brooklyn.
CORNELIA R. COWLES, Buffalo, N. Y.
LAURA BARNAVY, Salem.
J. ELIZABETH JONES, do.

[It was expected that other towns would be represented, but the names of the persons who were written to, have not yet been received. We hope the friends at Chagrin Falls, Richfield, Grafton, Canfield, Deerfield, New Richmond, Brunswick, New Brighton, West Middleton, Cleveland, Cincinnati and many other places will co-operate with us in this proposed work.]

Notice.

The Quarterly Meeting of the Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society will be held in New Lyme on the first Tuesday in May—meeting commencing at 10 o'clock. A. M. Rev. James W. Walker will address a general meeting in the afternoon. A full attendance is requested.

Hope points to a brighter day than the present—let us do what we can to hasten its approach. The cheerful donor as well as giver, God will bless.

R. M. COWLES, Secy.
Austintown, April 5, 1847.

American Anti-Slavery Society.

THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY.

The Thirtieth Annual Meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the Tabernacle, Broadway, N. Y., the 11th day of May. The increasing interest in the Anti-Slavery cause promises an unusually large and important meeting. The bold encroachments of the slave power upon the rights of the North, and the active measures of the slaveholders to extend and perpetuate the curse of human bondage, are awakening the people to a sense of their position both as oppressors and oppressed. All the activity and zeal of the friends of the slave are needed to arouse the country to the conviction that the only safety of the whole people is in adopting the principle of the American Anti-Slavery Society, of

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!

The place of the business meetings will be announced hereafter.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, President.
WENDELL PHILLIPS, Secretary.
S. H. GAY, Treasurer.

MARRIED.

On the 15th inst., by Joseph Grissell, Esq., Mr. JESSE SAPPAL to Miss MARTHA PAXSON, all of this county.

Anti-Slavery Books

Kept constantly on hand by J. Elizabeth Jones, among which are

The Fortin Hope.
Memoir of Torrey.
Fact and Fiction.
Anti-Slavery Alphabet.
Madison Papers.
Narrative of Douglass.
The Liberty Cap.
Brotherhood of Thieves.
Slaveholder's Religion.
Christian Non-Resistance.
Disunionist, &c.

N. B. Most of the above works can be procured of Betsey M. Cowles, Austintown.

CHEAP FOR CASH.

The proprietors of the Salem Hardware and Drug Store, have just received their full supply of NEW HARDWARE and FRESH DRUGS.

The patronage of their old customers, and the public generally is respectfully solicited.

CHESSMAN & WRIGHT.
Salem 11th mo 1, 1846.

THE SALEM BOOK-STORE

Has changed hands, and the New Firm having made considerable additions to the old stock, respectfully solicit the patronage of the old customers and the public. They are constantly receiving

SUPPLIES FROM THE EAST, of Books and Stationery, and Articles in their line not on hand will be ordered on short notice.

They will try to keep such an assortment and sell on such terms, as that no one need have an excuse for not reading. Schools and Merchants supplied on liberal terms.

GALBREATH & HOLMES.
D. L. GALBREATH, }
JESSE HOLMES, }
Salem, 1st mo 28th, 1846.

MEDICAL.

DRS. COPE & HOLE

Have associated for the practice of medicine. Having practised the WATER-CURE, until they are satisfied of its unequalled value, in the treatment not only of chronic but acute diseases, they are prepared to offer their professional services on the following conditions.

In all acute diseases, when called early, and when proper attention is given by the nurses, if they fail to effect cures, they will ask no fees. Residence east end of Salem. January 1, 1847.

WANTED,

1000 bushel dried Apples,
100,000 lbs. Pork,
50,000 lbs. Lard,
10 or 12 good Hoses.

Dec. 29th, 1846.

CONSTANTLY ON HAND.

Sole Leather, Upper Leather, Calf-Skins, Shoes, Boots, Sugar, Molasses, Tea, Coffee, Spice, Fish, Canned Candles, Tar by the kit and barrel. Turpentine, Sperma Oil, Flaxseed Oil, Paints, &c., &c., by

HEATON & IRISH.
Dec. 28th, 1846.

REMOVAL.

Grocer Ona has removed from the house of Ely, Kent & Brock, to the large and extensive Dry Goods house of

LUDWIG, KNEEDLER & CO.
No. 110, North 3d st, where he would be glad to have his Anti-Slavery friends call before making their Spring purchases elsewhere.
Philadelphia, Jan. 7th, 1847.—76.

JUST RECEIVED

Directly from Philadelphia, a fresh supply of beautiful plaid Linseys, black and brown Alpaca and Paisaminta Cloth, cheap Castles and Cloths, black and white Wadding, Plaid French Cloaking, and fashionable plaid silk bonnet linings by

HEATON & IRISH.
Dec. 28th 1846.

WATER CURE.

DR. J. D. COPE

Has just completed an addition to his Water Cure Establishment in Salem. He is now prepared to secure to an increased number of patients the full advantages of the Hydropathic practice.
Salem, Dec. 1846.

C. DONALDSON & CO.

Wholesale & Retail Hardware Merchants. Keep constantly on hand a general assortment of HARDWARE and CUTLERY.
No. 18 N. 3rd St. CINCINNATI.

July 17, '46.

